

by Democrats to increase the allowance for private and parochial schools that might be exempted when someone filed for bankruptcy, it was disallowed. When we asked to protect those who are paying the tuition of their children, it was disallowed. When we asked for relief dealing with identity theft debts, when someone would steal your credit cards, debt would pile up and all of a sudden you might have to pay that for some ridiculous reason, we asked for relief in that instance, it was denied.

When we asked for relief for those who were sexually assaulted and therefore we did not want the liability to be extinguished when someone went into the bankruptcy court, it was denied. It was denied that if you received dollars through a natural disaster such as the terrible flooding and hurricanes in Florida and you wanted to protect those dollars that you got from a natural disaster against a bankruptcy filing, it was denied.

Frankly, the democracy in this body has simply been denied. Democracy has shut down. This is a one-party government, one party in the administration, one party in the House, one party in the Senate, and there is no room for democracy. What a shame on us that we would push democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq and around the world, places that I have been, and we simply cannot have democracy in this body on behalf of the American people.

Let me also suggest that I am looking forward to responding to the request by Supreme Court Justice Rehnquist by offering a court security act for 2005 which responds to Justice Rehnquist and other Supreme Court Justices asking for more protection of judges and courthouses in America. It is a travesty that we would have the terrible, tragic act in Atlanta and the killing of the relatives of a judge in Illinois. It is time now to provide resources, training and, of course, security mechanisms to ensure that justice does occur, justice by way of protecting our courts and our court systems and all the parties who go into our court system for fairness and justice. I hope my colleagues will join me when I file the Securing American Courts Act of 2005. We owe our justice system that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THIRTYSOMETHING CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I just want to say that it is an honor again to address the House and the American people, also. I am sharing this hour today with the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), also. It is a pleasure to be here on the floor with her one more time.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Once again it is a pleasure to be here with you.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, if I may take just a moment to talk about a friend of ours and a pillar in Florida. Mr. Bill Lehman, Congressman William Lehman went on to glory today. He served our country well. He was blessed to be here for some 91 years. He passed away with his family by his side. He served in the 17th Congressional District, Madam Speaker, from the time of 1973 to 1992 with great distinction.

□ 2300

He was one of the longest serving, if not the longest serving, chairmen of the Transportation Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and did good works while he was here. A quiet man but a man that enjoyed to have a good time, and we will appropriately honor him with an hour here on the floor, designated by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), Democratic leader, at a later date, with reflections of friends that served with him in the Congress and also those Members who knew him well. And we send our prayers and appreciation to his family for allowing him to serve this great government of ours and play his role in democracy as the annals will reflect.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. My colleague from Florida is always so eloquent, and one of the things that has struck me from the time I have been privileged to serve in the Congress, for about 10 weeks now, is that we really stand on the shoulders of giants in this Chamber and there are precious few that fall into that category and that deserve that accolade. And Congress-

man Lehman was most definitely one of them.

I am privileged to represent a good portion of his district. I can only hope, as I am sure the gentleman can because he also represents a portion of his former district, that both he and I and our colleagues from South Florida can even begin to fill his shoes. Certainly it is our responsibility to carry on his legacy, and I know that is what we will strive to do every day on this floor, and I look forward to the hour that will be devoted to his life.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity. Not only I, but former Congresswoman Carrie Meek, the three of us had an opportunity to take a picture together. Congressman Lehman, in 1972, in the newly created 17th Congressional District, he ran for it. As the gentlewoman knows, he served in local government also and ran for that seat and won. So we are the only three that have served in the 17th Congressional District, and that was a good time. We have an opportunity to celebrate not only his life, but we will have an opportunity to celebrate his spirit for years to come. And I know that he is there with his good friend, Dante Fascell, and they are talking about old times when they used to run this House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. That is right, Madam Speaker. And if the gentleman will continue to yield, the one thing I want to add is that for those who did not know Congressman Lehman, his name was far more widely known because there are far too numerous to mention car dealerships across Florida and, quite honestly, Congressman Lehman was a leader in transportation for good reason, because there are thousands and thousands of drivers who began their driving careers thanks to Mr. Lehman and his family. And he has been not just a pillar of the community but a giant when it comes to transportation, and I think that should not be lost on this body.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments; and like I said, we will honor him appropriately on this great House floor.

Madam Speaker, I just want to once again thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for allowing us to represent the minority side here tonight and also to all of the leadership on the Democratic side. And being a Member of the House, it is always a great honor and privilege to come to the floor. So many Members before us have had this opportunity.

The 30-something Working Group that was created, and we have to talk about this every time because we have to make sure that Members understand that we are here to come to this floor to share good information and to make sure the American people know exactly what we are doing for them and also in some instances what we are doing to them, and I think it is very important that we remember that.

We have been talking a lot about Social Security lately, but tonight we are going to talk about the deficit. And I want to once again commend those groups that are out there on the Social Security front, before we get into the budget, that have been out there working very hard.

The President today made some comments from the White House. One thing that he did say, and I am glad that he has decided to come with the American people, was that privatization of Social Security will not resolve the Social Security issue. Some may say crisis; I say issue because Social Security is going to be solvent for the next 47 years, providing 100 percent of the benefits to the American people as they enjoy today, the 48 million Americans who celebrate benefits from Social Security, including survivor benefits that individuals that are receiving from those individuals that have passed on and have left something for their children.

Social Security will not end tomorrow. So I said we are going to be here on the budget. But it is interesting, when we start talking about the budget, that none of the philosophy or principles, because there is no plan, is not reflected in the budget. So we will talk about that a little bit more. But I want to just say that Democrats believe that for every issue that is facing our Nation, it is our responsibility to ensure the policies that we pursue are consistent with the values that we cherish. These guiding principles are particularly crucial when it comes to our children and the future generations.

The Bush administration budget and the Republican leadership budget fall short of protecting or investing in our children, in our young people. It is fiscally reckless, adding trillions to the deficit over the next 10 years, but we teach our children to save and be fiscally responsible.

It is morally irresponsible to slash health care programs that are for young people and seniors, I must add, in my opinion. Education and youth development programs that provide our children opportunities to achieve the American Dream are crucial.

In Proverbs it tells us to "train up a child in the way he should go and when he is old, he will not depart from it." I think that it is important that we hold that as a value and cherish that here in this House. If the lessons to our children and young people are reflected in the House Republican budget, then we have failed them and ourselves and the future of the democracy.

We have only about 20 more minutes to talk, but we are going to share some of the values of the Democratic budget versus the Republican budget. And I must say there are some individuals that are well intended on the majority side, I must add; but they are being overwhelmed by individuals who are willing to fight for others and not fight for all. So I think it is important that we share the facts here tonight.

And I would love to here some of the gentlewoman's opening comments, and

hopefully we can get into some of these charts we have so that we can share with the American people what is happening here in this House.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Absolutely, Madam Speaker. And I think it has to be said that the gentleman has been an incredible leader in co-chairing with our colleague from Ohio this 30-something Working Group. We are really here to talk to our generation, to talk to the American people in our generation about the policy decisions that are made here in Washington and how it affects them.

I think the gentleman is right. I think we have a number of well-intentioned colleagues on the other side. But, unfortunately, this train is being driven by the right. It is being driven by the right wing of the Republican Congress. They are driving the train here, and the moderate voice is just completely snuffed out. Absolutely snuffed out.

And I think we should spend a little bit of time talking about how the Bush administration's budget affects education because a lot has been said and the President has touted this Pell grant increase as being so fantastic and how he has really made a commitment to expanding access to higher education. When we sift through the facts and the reality as to how he gets to that \$100 increase in Pell grants, it is really astonishing that they would claim it is an increase.

Essentially, when he was campaigning in 2000, the President pledged to make college more affordable and accessible by increasing the maximum Pell grant for college freshmen to \$5,100.

□ 2310

He broke his promise once again. Once again, he says one thing and does another. They talk about numbers over here, and they are much higher or much lower, the opposite of what they promise, again and again.

Since 2001, just to give the facts, the cost of attending a four year public college has increased by more than \$2,300. And what was President Bush's response? To increase the maximum Pell Grant by \$10 to \$4,150 in 2006. But that would only pay for 4 percent of the college cost increases since 2001.

The way he finances this Pell Grant increase is by cutting, essentially decimating, many, many other student aid programs. We have a chart here that I will move over and try to walk you through.

Essentially the Bush budget completely eliminates the Perkins loan program, a \$66 million cut. If that proposal is enacted, more than 670,000 borrowers in 2006 alone would lose out on loan forgiveness if they choose to serve this country by becoming teachers, law enforcement officers or serve in the military. It totally eliminates that program.

The Bush budget forces millions of low and middle income students to pay

thousands more for their college loans, because they eliminate the current low fixed consolidation benefits. According to the nonpartisan, their numbers, Congressional Research Service, this change will force the typical student borrower to pay about \$5,500 more in college loans.

The President also, in order to give you a measly \$100 increase in your Pell Grants, he also completely eliminates the funds for Gear Up, for Upward Bound and for the Talent Search programs. These programs ensure that high risk students succeed in high school and move on to college. If the President has his way, nearly 1.3 million students, 70 percent of whom are minorities, will lose the support they need to make it to college.

This is how we are improving access to higher education in the Bush budget. It is just astonishing.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Well, reclaiming my time, I am so glad that the gentlewoman pointed that out, because I think it is important that the Members pay very close attention to what is happening. I think not only do we have the constitutional responsibility, but we have the responsibility to the people that elected us in our districts to make sure we are not followers, but leaders in this process.

I can tell you I take no pleasure, Madam Speaker, to be a part of a Congress that oversees the highest deficit in this history of the Republic. I must say at no other time in this country's history we have had the deficit that we have right now in, and it is very unfortunate that this is going to be passed on to not only my children and grandchildren, but definitely those that are yet unborn.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) and I are both parents. In many instances our children are going to be okay because of who we are and why we are here. But I can tell you that my constituents, and I know your constituents, did not say, well, I want to send you all to Congress so you can have better health care than I have, so that your children will have better opportunities than my children have. They sent us here to make sure we do not hand their children a bad deal. Because the goal of any parent or grandparent is to make sure that their children and grandchildren have a better opportunity than what they had.

I have a chart here that I want to share with the Members. As you can see, this is what has happened as relates to the backsliding here into the deficit ditch. This deficit went from a surplus, I must add, during the Clinton years when he started, and this House I must add, balanced the budget without one Republican vote, I must add, balanced the budget, and we were into surplus, some \$263 billion in the surplus.

Now we have found ourselves in a downward spiral since this administration and this emboldened Republican

majority here in this House has taken us to some \$4 trillion projected deficit. I think it is important that we understand that this is real money, these are just not numbers, and it is taking our children even further down.

I have another chart here, and I am going to talk rather quickly because I know we have to move on here. This is what is going on as relates to the interest payments on the deficit, on the debt, and I think that it is only getting worse.

As you can see here, in the 2004 budget, money that is being spent, we are spending more money on paying down the debt, and this number here is actually in the billions, I must add, some \$150 billion in the 2004 budget. But better yet, here in education we are spending less than we are spending on taking down the debt.

Also as you start looking at the environment here in purple, we are spending far less than we are spending in paying off the debt because of irresponsible spending. And if you go further over, our veterans, our patriots, so many of us talk about them. I am on the Committee on Armed Services, we have a lot of chest beating going on in that committee about who loves the troops and who does not love the troops, and who loves veterans and who does not love veterans, and folks start talking about the tattoos on their chest that they love the troops and all of this.

But I can tell you one thing as it relates to our spending in the 2004 budget, it does not reflect our values. I was talking about Proverbs a little bit more, but I will come back to that a little later.

I think it is important for us to also look at the amounts spent by 2010 if we continue onto this track. This big red mountain here is not education, it is not the environment, it is not transportation, it is not spending money on our veterans, making sure that we hold up our end of the deal that we said we would provide to them if they serve our country. No, it is the debt. It is the Federal debt as the way we see it now and the way it will be seen up until 2010.

I think it is also important for you to see education and where it stands as it relates to the debt and environment and veterans and so on.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. If the gentleman will yield on the debt, I want to just follow up with what you are saying about debt. If we can come on over to this chart, this talks about how the debt actually impacts families. Because debt, when you talk about trillions, one thing I noticed about this job that we have that our constituents so graciously gave us, is that when you start talking about billions and trillions of dollars, people's eyes start to glaze over. I have learned the difference between a billion and a trillion, and it is a lot of money. And what this debt means is a lot of money to the average family of four.

Going up the scale here with the ever-increasing debt that the Bush budgets have put on us, we are now going to reach, in 2004, the Bush budget raises the debt tax, which is basically what the debt costs every family of four in America, right now it is costing every family in America almost \$4,400.

You go up the scale with the Bush budget proposal, and we are not even talking about Social Security, we are talking about what we have got right here, right now, not even talking about privatizing Social Security. By 2015, each family of four would have \$10,500 that they essentially would responsibility for in terms of a debt tax and how much the debt was going to cost them.

That is where we have gone in this country. We are just going to keep adding and adding and weighing people down. What happens with our generation, on the front page of the South Florida Sun Sentinel the other day, I was flying up here, and the front page talked about "Generation Debt."

Our generation is Generation Debt, because we are not the generation of savers. Our parents and our grandparents were the generation of savers, but we are not. So we are already shouldering a tremendous amount, way more than we should, in personal debt. On top of that, the President heaps this on top of us also, and it is just wrong.

If you are going to talk about what we are doing here, you have to talk about jobs and technology and how that is going to affect our generation.

The number one issue for young people right now, for our generation, is finding a job. We supposedly have this fantastic reemergence of the economy, but job creation is still totally flat.

The current unemployment rate for individuals 16 to 19 is 17 percent. And, more and more, those young people need a job. We are not just talking about a paper route anymore, we are talking about kids who are 16 to 19 years old who need to earn a salary to help pay the family's bills. If they do not have a job, then their family is falling down flat. And the President's budget contains absolutely no job growth stimulation proposals, it squanders \$1.6 trillion on tax breaks to people who do not need them.

Job training: We have no proposals for job training. In fact, the President cuts job training in his budget. He consolidates it into a single block grant, and then cuts the funding for these programs, for job training programs, by \$146 million.

He eliminates the Advanced Technology Program, and I am trying to speed along also, which funds research and emerging technologies.

His budget slashes by nearly 60 percent the funds from the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, which is a program that helps small manufacturers with new technologies.

And lastly, our generation cares about the Internet. There are so many opportunities in expanding access to

high speed Internet. This President has proposed to slash broadband assistance guaranteed loans by \$190 million, and he has called for the total elimination of broadband telecommunications grants.

Are they thinking about our folks? They are clearly not. They have no interest in what is going to happen to the generation coming behind the one that already has theirs.

□ 2320

That is what we have got to do. We have got to make sure we can refocus the attention that is paid to our generation because no one is thinking about us.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I can tell the gentlewoman that tomorrow on this floor Members will not only vote on the Republican budget but will also vote on the Democratic budget that we have put forth, and I must say that our budget will balance out in the next 10 years.

There has been so much cake and ice cream given out in the last 4 years and from the majority side. I want us to confuse Members and start talking about the President. The President proposed the budget of course, but we come up with our own budget. And I can tell you if you think the President's budget is bad, you need to look at the majority-side budget.

I can tell you some of my friends are Republicans and I can tell you this, here in the House, some of them are fiscal conservatives but they do not want to make a career decision as it relates to their position in this House to vote against their very own budget.

I will also tell you this, if one is a fiscal conservative there is no way in the world they can vote for that budget. I am very proud of the work that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and others have done on the budget. In our Democratic budget we have given \$1.6 billion more than the Republican budget for veterans health care and also for other programs for 2006, and \$17 billion more over the next 5 years. The Democratic budget also reversed the \$798 million cut to veteran affairs which helped veterans and their families.

I must also share, not only with the Members, 77 percent of the troops that are in Iraq and Afghanistan are under the age of 30 years old. These young people should be paid the attention that the Congress should reflect their future and their families' future, and I think that is important.

I do not want to get too far away because I want to make sure people truly understand this because I know there are about 100 charts in this Chamber. I can tell you for every chart we have, we not only have the source, this is from the Treasury International Capital System from the House Committee on the Budget, the Democratic staff.

This is what foreign countries like China and others, what they pay for our debt. We go to them. We ask them

for money. They buy our bonds and they pay our debt. Now we are 44 percent indebted to foreign countries. And you can see how it has risen since the majority party has been emboldened by having the President in the White House. First it was 30 percent in 2000. In 2001 it was 30 percent. In 2002 it was 34 percent. In 2003, 37 percent; and 2004, 44 percent and climbing. There is no decline. There is no effort to bring a decline now.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. There is a name for that.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. What is the name?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Borrow and spend.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is very interesting because I heard some folks in here talking about borrowing and spending and blaming us. There is more spending that is going on, but it has not just been about the war. It has been about irresponsible policy-making here.

I want to say we want to thank those that contact us via e-mail. We receive quite a bit of e-mail from not only the American people, but also even within this Capitol complex. If you want to e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov, we would appreciate it.

If you want to learn more not only about Social Security but about the Democratic budget, you can go on to Democraticleader.house.gov/30something. But you can go on the Democratic leader's Web site and get what we are doing here and what we are proposing.

I think it is also important for us to talk about. One may say, why are you all talking about what the Republican budget, what they are doing to the American people?

The reason why we are talking about it is because we are not in the majority. We fought all day on this floor, 5 hours of amendments, 5 hours of debate to fight on behalf of the everyday worker and retired American in this country. And if we were in the majority, it would be totally different. Those numbers I gave on veterans, the veterans would have what they need. The true budget balancing will happen in 10 years. We have made Social Security, the issue of privatization, we can tell the President to stop spending the taxpayers' money and burning Federal jet fuel, because it is not going to happen.

So until we are able to get the majority, then we will not be able to do some of the things we are doing; but we will fight to the bitter end to make sure that we protect American people and their values.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. In the last several weeks I have tried to talk about the impact on women that the Bush administration's policies have had. For example, there are 20 million women in this country without health insurance and millions more who can barely afford to pay their premiums; but this budget does nothing to hold

down health care costs. It slashes Medicaid by a total of \$45 billion over the next 10 years. That is a devastating cut on women and children because women account for over 70 percent of adult Medicaid beneficiaries.

In terms of violence against women, the President's budget cuts the Violence Against Women Act programs by \$19 million; child care, the budget freezes funding for the Maternal and Child Health block grant and eliminates the Universal Newborn Screening Program.

Now, I have a 19-month-old. You have young children. I have passed legislation in Florida that ensured that we expanded screening for genetic anomalies and problems in newborns, and this Bush budget reverses all of that progress.

If we do not make sure we screen newborns for hearing problems, then we will have learning disabilities that are directly related to hearing abnormalities and without any excuse. But we have got to make sure that we think about children and families when prioritizing and that is what we could do. And the proof is in the pudding that we do not.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Does the gentlewoman have something else to talk about?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I also wanted to talk a little bit about health care because one of the most important issues that we have in this country is the skyrocketing cost of health care.

We have 45 million Americans who do not have health insurance. That means when they are sick, they cannot go to the doctor and they have to let their health care problems spiral out of control until they have to go to the emergency room to get the problem solved. And young Americans, our generation, are the most likely group to be insured. We think we are invincible. We think we are not going to have to worry about having health insurance and going to the doctor, so we go without. But more often we also cannot afford it.

Thirty percent of young adults age 18 to 24 have no health insurance at all. Compare that with 18 percent of adults who are 35 to 44 and only 1 percent of seniors. So the health care crisis disproportionately affects our generation, and there is nothing in the Bush budget to improve that. Where is this President's leadership on expanding access to health care?

When I go down the street, when I go to the supermarket at home, when I go to street festivals, people stop me in the street. I have heard the gentleman talk about people stopping him in the street and talking about issues that are important to them. The thing that they stop me on the most often is education and health care.

They say, if my baby girl or my baby boy is sick, I have no health insurance and I cannot get them shots. If they have a cold, I cannot bring them to the doctor. I have to wait until the prob-

lem is bad enough to bring them to the emergency room, and no mother or father should have to suffer through something like that.

This President needs to exercise some leadership in this budget on how to solve this problem and he has not. It is an abdication of leadership.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I want to close and touch a little on CDBG, which is the Community Development Block Grants.

The Republican budget cuts funding for Community Development Block Grants by \$8 billion over the next 5 years. These cuts will likely fall on Community Development Block Grants which the Republicans have proposed to eliminate, I must add eliminate. These cuts will have a significant negative impact on the ability of State and local governments to be able to provide housing and community development needs.

Last year, 1.6 billion of CDBG dollars were used for housing, and the result of that was 120,000 homeowners received assistance for rehabbing or working on their homes; and 11,000 families became first-time home buyers, and 19,000 rental units were being rehabbed.

The proposed CDBG cuts will have a particularly severe impact on the resources provided by housing and job training, domestic violence prevention, child care assistance, homeless assistance, small business development, and other services.

The Democratic budget provides \$2 billion more than the Republican budget for 2006 and \$9 billion for over the next 5 years. Community and regional development will be eliminated and the downward spiral of these block grants will be detrimental to so many communities.

I want to say to the city and county mayors, you need to call your Congressman and your Congresswoman and the Members of the other body and the administration and say the cutting of what we need will hurt our communities.

□ 2330

SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight an important